



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/564,811 | 01/17/2006 | Lawrence Kesteloot | 217.1023.02 | 3403 |
| 78037 | 7590 | 09/30/2011 | EXAMINER | |
| KALEIDESCAPE, INC. 440 POTRERO AVE. SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4117 | | | | STEVENS, ROBERT |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | 2162 | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | | | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 09/30/2011 | | | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENTS@KALEIDESCAPE.COM

| | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/564,811 Examiner ROBERT STEVENS | KESTELOOT ET AL. Art Unit 2162 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
 - 5a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 1-2, 4-7, 62 and 148-164 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,2,4-7,10-19,21-36,57-63,73-82,84-90,112-124,127-133 and 135-164.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 10-19,21-36,57-61,63,74-82,84-90,112-124,127-133 and 135-147.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Office maintains the previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC §§101, 112-2nd paragraph and 103(a), in light of the amendment.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 6/20/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the previous rejection of claims 1-2, 4-7, 148-155 and 158-164 under 35 USC 103(a), Applicant argues on pages 26-28 that the references do not teach a limitation of these claims because “instructing the video controller to fit a video's entire width or height into a display window is not equivalent to adjusting placement of an active area within a display screen.

The Office respectfully disagrees, noting that the references as a whole teach the recited claim language. For example, Hodgkinson teaches the changing of size and/or shape of a window, which would perforce change/adjust the placement of that window within a display screen.

Therefore, the references have been reasonably interpreted as teaching the recited claim language.

Applicant further argues on pages 28-29 that claims 62 and 156-157 are allowable for the reasons argued above.

The Office respectfully disagrees, and counter-asserts the rationale set forth above.

It is further noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. *In re Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-1333, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

The Office also notes MPEP § 2144.01, that quotes *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968) as stating "in considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." Further MPEP 2123, states that "a reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989).

For at least these reasons, the Office asserts the rejections of the claims as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-2, 4-7, 148-155 and 158-164 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Breen (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0117735, hereafter referred to as “Breen”) in view of Hodgkinson (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0126142, hereafter referred to as “Hodgkinson”).

Regarding independent claim 1: Breen teaches *A method, comprising: displaying a media stream in an active area of a display screen*, (See Breen Fig. 1 #14 in the context of the Abstract teaching a user device for displaying video content.) *receiving metadata associated with said media stream from a remote database;* (See Breen Fig. 1 #26, 30 and 34 in the context of the Abstract teaching stored metadata associated with video content.)

However, Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses *said media stream comprising a sequence of frames of fields, each frame or field containing a portion of interest that is smaller than the frame or field* (See

Hodgkinson [0007] discussing changing of size and/or shape of a window, it having been implied that such a change encompassed smaller and larger windows. See also [0003] discussing the scaling and “correct positioning” of MPEG video.) *and in response to said metadata, adjusting placement of said active area within said display screen such that said portion of interest is displayed in said active area.* (See Hodgkinson [0031] – [0032] in the context of [0003] and [0007] teaching the adjustment of size / positioning of the video display.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant’s subject matter to apply the teachings of Hodgkinson for the benefit of Breen, because to do so allowed a workflow management system to flexibly accommodate ad hoc deviations to a business process, as taught by Hodgkinson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., video display management.

Regarding claim 2: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses *wherein said adjusting further comprises adjusting masking elements so that a viewable area of said display screen takes on an aspect ratio associated with said media stream.* (See Hodgkinson [0004] discussing the conventional use of black bars and cutting off parts of video that do not fit on the display.)

Regarding claim 4: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses *wherein said metadata comprises: a specified aspect ratio associated with said media stream; and an adjustment from a known aspect ratio to said*

specified aspect ratio. (See Hodgkinson [0031] discussing an adjustment to accommodate the proper aspect ratio.)

Regarding claim 5: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses ***wherein said adjusting further comprises automatically controlling one or more physical masks.*** (See Hodgkinson [0004] discussing that it was conventionally known to use “black bars” and cutting off parts of video.)

Regarding independent claim 6: Breen teaches ***A method, comprising: presenting a media stream on a display screen having masking elements;*** (See Breen Fig. 1 #14 in the context of the Abstract teaching a user device for displaying video content.) ***receiving metadata associated with said media stream, said metadata indicating desired digital content within said media stream;*** (See Breen Fig. 1 #26, 30 and 34 in the context of the Abstract teaching stored metadata associated with video content.)

However, Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses ***said media stream comprising a sequence of frames of fields, each frame or field containing a portion of interest that is smaller than the frame or field*** (See Hodgkinson [0007] discussing changing of size and/or shape of a window, it having been implied that such a change encompassed smaller and larger windows. See also [0003] discussing the scaling and “correct positioning” of MPEG video.) ***and adjusting a size and/or position of an active area of said display screen in response to said metadata such that said portion of***

interest is displayed in said active area. (See Hodgkinson [0031] – [0032] in the context of [0003] and [0007] teaching the adjustment of size / positioning of the video display.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's subject matter to apply the teachings of Hodgkinson for the benefit of Breen, because to do so allowed a workflow management system to flexibly accommodate ad hoc deviations to a business process, as taught by Hodgkinson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., video display management.

Regarding claim 7: Breen teaches ***wherein said adjusting comprises automatically moving said masking elements so that a viewable area of said display screen takes on an aspect ratio associated with said media stream.*** (See Breen [0004] discussing the conventional use of black bars and cutting off parts of video to accommodate different aspect ratios.)

Regarding claim 148: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses ***wherein said physical masks are capable of obscuring and revealing some portions of said display screen.*** (See Hodgkinson [0004] discussing the conventional use of black bars and cutting off parts of video that do not fit on the display.)

Regarding claim 149: Breen teaches ***sending feedback information from a viewer of said media stream to said remote database; and conditionally incorporating said feedback information into said database, whereby viewers subsequently receiving said metadata also***

receive said feedback information. (See Breen Fig. 3 #62 teaching the sending of a response to the client.)

Regarding claim 150: Breen teaches *conditionally adjusting an aspect ratio of said display screen in response to input from an end viewer of said media stream; and sending adjusted aspect ratio data from said end viewer to said remote database.* (See Hodgkinson [0004] discussing the conventional use of black bars and cutting off parts of video that do not fit on the display.)

Regarding claim 151: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses *conditionally adjusting an aspect ratio of said display screen in response to input from an end viewer of said media stream; and sending adjusted aspect ratio data from said end viewer to said remote database.* (See Hodgkinson [0031] – [0032] in the context of [0003] and [0007] teaching the adjustment of size / positioning of the video display.)

Regarding claim 152: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses *wherein said adjusting placement further comprises: recognizing a set of elements to be presented within said media stream, said set of elements having a different aspect ratio from the digital content; and adjusting a target location for that set of elements in response to an aspect ratio of said media stream.* (See Hodgkinson [0004] discussing the conventional use of black bars and cutting off parts of video that do not fit on the

display, and [0031] – [0032] in the context of [0003] and [0007] teaching the adjustment of size / positioning of the video display.)

Regarding claim 153: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses *wherein said set of elements comprises at least one of: a caption, a closed-caption, a subtitle, a translation and a ticker feed.* (See Hodgkinson [0018] discussing the use of text that can flow around the video display window.)

Regarding claim 154: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses *conditionally adjusting the aspect ratio of the displayed content in response to an on-screen display, said on-screen display being available to an end viewer of said media stream, and indicating placement for physical masks and sidebars.* (See Hodgkinson [0004] teaching the use of black bars and cutting off portions of video.)

Regarding claim 155: Breen teaches *identifying said media stream to be displayed; sending a request to said remote database for said metadata; parsing said metadata to yield one or more informational components; and interpreting at least one result of said parsing.* (See Breen Fig. 3 in the context of Fig. 1, teaching the use of associated content and metadata profiles, and sending a response to the user display device.)

Regarding claim 158: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses *wherein said adjusting further comprises: presenting a desired picture and excluding a remainder of a video frame, in response to said metadata, said metadata indicating a portion of said video frame occupied by said desired picture.* (See Hodgkinson [0004] discussing the conventional use of black bars and cutting off parts of video that do not fit on the display.)

Regarding claim 159: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses *wherein said metadata comprises at least one of: a preselected aspect ratio; and an adjustment from a known aspect ratio.* (See Hodgkinson [0004] discussing the conventional use of aspect ratios.)

Regarding claim 160: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses *wherein said media stream comprises a video stream having first and second elements; the metadata includes information associating each of the first and the second elements of the video stream with some independent combination of aspect ratio, horizontal size, vertical size, resolution, anamorphic compression, and letterboxing; and further comprising: selecting a target location on said display screen for each of the first and second elements in response to said metadata.* (See Hodgkinson [0004] discussing the conventional use of aspect ratios.)

Regarding claim 161: Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Hodgkinson, though, discloses *wherein said displaying comprises projecting a modified image of a desired picture of a video frame of said media stream, such that said active area contains the desired picture while excluding at least some portion of said video frame.* (See Hodgkinson [0004] teaching the use of black bars and cutting off portions of video.)

Regarding claim 162: Breen teaches *wherein said active area of said display screen comprises at least one of: a reflective portion of said display screen visible to the human viewer; and an illuminated portion of said display screen visible to a human viewer.* (See Breen Fig. 1 #14 teaching the use of a user device with a region for display of content.)

Regarding claim 163: Breen teaches *wherein said adjusting is responsive to triggering of one or more watch points in said media stream.* (See Breen [0021] discussing that the metadata profiles are related to a video timeline.)

Regarding independent claim 164: Breen teaches *A method of displaying a motion picture including a sequence of frames of fields, each frame or field containing a portion of interest that is smaller than the frame or field, the method comprising: receiving a selection from a user of a motion picture;* (See Breen Fig. 3 #50 in the context of the Abstract teaching a request for video content.) *obtaining from a database metadata associated with the selected motion picture;* (See Breen Fig. 1 #26, 30 and 34 in the context of the Abstract teaching stored

metadata associated with video content.) ***displaying the motion picture;*** (See Breen Fig. 1 #14 in the context of the Abstract teaching a user device for displaying video content.)

However, Breen does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed.

Hodgkinson, though, discloses ***and adjusting masking means in response to the metadata so that substantially only the portion of interest is visible.*** (See Hodgkinson [0031] – [0032] in the context of [0003] and [0007] teaching the adjustment of size / positioning of the video display.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's subject matter to apply the teachings of Hodgkinson for the benefit of Breen, because to do so allowed a workflow management system to flexibly accommodate ad hoc deviations to a business process, as taught by Hodgkinson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., video display management.

5. **Claims 62 and 156-157 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Breen (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0117735, hereafter referred to as "Breen") in view of Hodgkinson (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0126142, hereafter referred to as "Hodgkinson") and Zimmerman (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0007001, hereafter referred to as "Zimmerman").

Regarding claim 62: Breen in view of Hodgkinson does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Zimmerman, though, discloses ***wherein said adjusting***

comprises displaying a color that minimizes burn-in in an inactive area of said display. (See Zimmerman [0024] Table 1 teaches the use of color settings.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's subject matter to apply the teachings of Zimmerman for the benefit of Breen in view of Hodgkinson, because to do so enabled a search engine to identify pertinent documents in any supported language, as taught by Zimmerman in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., video display management.

Regarding claim 156: Breen in view of Hodgkinson does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Zimmerman, though, discloses *wherein said metadata includes some combination of: an aspect ratio; audio encoding specification; and other device control information.* (See Zimmerman [0024] Table 1 showing a variety of exemplary device control data / parameters.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's subject matter to apply the teachings of Zimmerman for the benefit of Breen in view of Hodgkinson, because to do so enabled a search engine to identify pertinent documents in any supported language, as taught by Zimmerman in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., video display management.

Regarding claim 157: Breen in view of Hodgkinson does not explicitly teach the remaining limitations as claimed. Zimmerman, though, discloses *controlling one or more:*

lights; cooling systems; or audio systems in response to said metadata. (See Zimmerman [0024] and Table 1 showing the use of sound settings information / parameters.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's subject matter to apply the teachings of Zimmerman for the benefit of Breen in view of Hodgkinson, because to do so enabled a search engine to identify pertinent documents in any supported language, as taught by Zimmerman in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., video display management.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-Patent Literature

Klippgen, W., et al., "The Use of Metadata for the Rendering of Personalized Video Delivery", MCL Technical Report 12-01-1996, Boston Univ. Multimedia Communications Laboratory, Boston, MA, © 1996, pp. 1-31.

Casares, Juan, et al., "Simplifying Video Editing with Intelligent Interaction", Adjunct Proceedings CHI 2002: Human Factors in Computing Systems, Minneapolis, MN, Apr. 20-25, 2002, pp. 1-8.

US Patent Application Publications

| | |
|-------------------|--------------|
| Roth et al | 2008/0166067 |
| Uyttendaele et al | 2004/0239699 |
| Lau et al | 2003/0052906 |
| Perkes | 2003/0122965 |

US Patents

| | |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Boreczky et al | 6,366,296 |
| Alexander et al | 6,380,968 |
| Callahan et al | 6,396,473 |
| Lau et al | 6,633,309 |
| Lau et al | 6,681,043 |
| Jordan et al | 6,100,936 |
| Lanier | 6,400,374 |
| Edanami | 6,297,846 |
| King et al | 5,621,428 |
| Katseff et al | 5,822,537 |
| Goldberg et al | 5,963,203 |
| Yang et al | 5,557,298 |
| Levinthal et al | 5,557,302 |
| Lobodzinski | 5,619,995 |
| Dye | 5,838,334 |
| Blank | 5,469,536 |
| Blanton et al | 4,873,585 |

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert Stevens/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162

September 23, 2011